

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

In the detailed office action July 28, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10. Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doust. The Examiner also objected to certain informalities in the specification.

In this amendment, the specification has been amended to correct carious informalities and claims 2 and 7 have been amended to be independent claims incorporating the limitations of canceled claims 1 and 6, respectively. In amending claim 2 the limitations previously presented in claim 1 have been somewhat rephrased in order to enhance their clarity.


In view of the claim amendments made herein, it is believed that the rejections under §112 are rendered moot; however, the rejection of claim 6 on these grounds is respectfully traversed. Claim 6 recites "acting on", not - - active on - - as stated by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that, in the context of the present invention, the meaning and operation of frictional clutch acting on a shaft is sufficiently clear to a person of ordinary skill in the art. For example, paragraph [0017] of the instant specification explains that the frictional clutching means reduces the rotating speed, *i.e.*, "acts on", the drum shaft. Paragraph [0018] goes on to explain in detail how the mechanism of one exemplary embodiment would function and thus "act on" the drum shaft.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the application as a whole is in proper form for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Date: October 28, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas D. Kohler

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
2 Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306
(415) 442-1106

32,797
(Reg. No.)